REMARKS

Claims 1 to 4, 6 to 16, 18 to 25, and 27 to 32 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 13, and 25 are independent.[1] Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, the claims were rejected under §101 for allegedly not producing a tangible result. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite that the version conflict is resolved to enable use of a version of the learning object in the electronic learning system. Use of the learning objects constitutes a tangible result in that they may be used to present content of the electronic learning system to a learner. Accordingly, the claims are believed to produce a tangible result. Withdrawal of the §101 rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

All of the claims were rejected under §102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,162,060 (Richard). As shown above, Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite that detecting a version conflict comprises determining if a first version of the learning object in the local repository references two different versions of the learning object. Richard is not understood to disclose or to suggest at least this feature of the claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the art rejection over Richard is respectfully requested.

In this regard, Richard does describe maintaining different versions of an electronic course (see, e.g., relation/table 201 of Fig. 2). However, Richard maintains different versions of entire courses – not versions of learning objects within those courses. This is relevant because,

[1] The Examiner is urged to independently confirm this recitation of the pending claims.

in Richard, the different versions do not reference each other. By contrast, according to the

claims, a version conflict is detected by determining if a first version of a learning object in a

local repository references two different versions of the learning object.

The Office Action alleges that Richard at columns 2 to 4, lines 58 to 67 of column 6, and

lines 1 to 12 of column 7 describes determining if an existing object references two different

versions of the learning object.[2] Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of

Richard. More specifically, the cited portions of Richard merely describe storing different

versions of courses and identifying which of those are obsolete, as explained below:

> Returning to FIG. 2, relation (also known as table) 201 contains the status of each course. As
> courses are updated older versions of the courses become obsolete. The status column is used to
> store information about which courses are current and which are obsolete. The date column serves
> a dual purpose, namely, for current courses it indicates when that version became the current
> version, and for obsolete versions, the date column indicates when the course will no longer be
> available. As can be inferred from FIG. 3, an obsolete course may remain available after it has
> become obsolete, so as to allow students to complete the same version of a course as the version in
> which they started the course. However, after a predetermined obsolescence period the course is
> made unavailable, regardless of whether certain students have yet to complete it.[3]

As is clear from the foregoing passage, there is nothing whatsoever that describes one version of

a course (or a component thereof) referencing another version, much less detecting a conflict on

that basis. The same is true for columns 2 to 4.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 13 and 25 are believed to be

patentable over the art.

---

[2] Page 4 of the Office Action
[3] Col. 4, line 57 to col. 7, line 4

Applicants : Wolfgang Theilmann, et al.
Serial No. : 10/699,477
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 12 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 13909-100001
Client Ref.: 2002P10191US01

The dependent claims are also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, each has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. The absence, however, of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been addressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.

Applicants : Wolfgang Theilmann, et al.
Serial No. : 10/699,477
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 13909-100001
Client Ref.: 2002P10191US01

Please apply any fees or credits due in this case to Deposit Account 06-1050 referencing

Attorney Docket No. 13909-100001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _Dec 13 2007_

Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

2002p10191 us01.doc